

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed February 17, 2005. Upon entry of this response, claims 8-10 and 44-71 are pending in the application. In this response, claim 8 has been amended, claims 44-71 have been added, and claims 1-7 and 11-43 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 11-18, 22-30, 32-38, and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 11-18, 22-30, 32-38, and 43-44 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Amrany et al.* (U.S. 6,711,207) in view of *Advanced Configuration and Power Interface Specification, Revision 2.0*, (hereinafter *ACPI*). Claims 1-7, 11-18, 22-30, 32-38, and 43-44 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public.

2. Rejection of Claims 8-10, 19-21, and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-10, 19-21, and 39-42 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Amrany et al.* (U.S. 6,711,207) in view of *Advanced Configuration and Power Interface Specification, Revision 2.0*, (hereinafter *ACPI*) and further in view of *Helms et al.* (U.S. 6,144,695). Claims 8-10, 19-21, and 39-42 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims

in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public.

3. Rejection of Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 31 has been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Amrany et al.* (U.S. 6,711,207) in view of *Advanced Configuration and Power Interface Specification, Revision 2.0*, (hereinafter *ACPI*) and further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Claim 31 is cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of this claim is therefore rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of this cancelled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public.

4. Newly Added Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 44-71 are allowable over the cited references. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 44 and 52 are allowable for at least the reason that the cited reference do not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of a "transmitter power manager configured to provide power, in response to the detection, to a first at least one element residing in said transmitter unit, and further configured to provide power, after a predefined delay, to a second at least one element residing in said transmitter unit." Independent claim 60 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited reference do not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of a "providing power, in response to the detection, to a first at least one element residing in said transmitter unit; and providing power, after a predefined delay, to a second at least one element residing in said transmitter unit." Independent

claim 66 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited reference do not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “a detector configured to detect the presence of said packetized digital communication signal by monitoring activity of one of the constant-power components having a processing time greater than the power-down component activation time.” Finally, independent claim 69 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited reference do not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “detecting the presence of said packetized digital communication signal by monitoring the processing activity of one of said first series components having an associated processing time greater than a power-up time of a second component residing in said transmitter unit.” Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner enter and allow the above new claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 8-10 and 44-71 be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By: 
Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933